REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 87-101 remain pending in this application, with Claims 87, 92 and 97 being independent. Claims 87, 92, 93, 97, 98, and 100 have been amended herein.

The amendments to the claims are believed to be fully supported by the original specification and drawings. For example, the first determination unit or step is supported by step S3109 in Figure 31, the second determination unit or step by S3113, the third determination unit or step by S3114, the first condition of change unit by S3115 and Figure 29, the second condition of the change unit or step by S3115 and Figure 30, and the third condition of the change unit or step by steps S3114-No-S3116. Of course, the claims are not intended to be limited in scope to this preferred embodiment.

In the final Office Action dated May 9, 2007, Claims 87, 89-92, 94-97, and 99-101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,467,434 (Hower, Jr. et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,267,727 (DeHority). Claims 88, 93, and 98 were rejected under § 103 in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,130,757 (Ito). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As understood by Applicants, Hower, Jr. et al. discloses an apparatus for determining printer option availability and representing conflict resolution in a combination of print job selections. Hower, Jr. et al. further discloses display means for permitting a user to choose media description parameters and finishing options and a printer having the capability of suggesting an alternative combination to a conflicting combination chosen by

a user.

DeHority discloses a system for determining the best match between paper requirements and printer capability. As discussed previously, when a mismatch occurs, the paper with the lowest mismatch magnitude is designated. The system can also determine the best match between the document requirements and printer capability of stapling, folding, duplexing, and stacking. An operator is given an opportunity to correct any mismatches.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that Hower, Jr. et al. and DeHority, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of the change unit or change step recited in the independent claims. The claimed change unit or change step recites three contingencies: (1) When it is determined that the user makes a selection, a window is displayed for accepting a selection by the user, and when the user has made a selection of a change of a setting of a second setting item from a second value into a fourth value, a display of the second setting item is changed from the second value into the fourth value so as to avoid the conflict between the second setting item and the first setting item. (2) When it is determined that the user makes the selection, a window for accepting a selection by a user is displayed, and when the user has not made a selection of a change of the setting of the second setting item, a display of the second setting item is left as the second value. (3) When it is determined that the user does not make the selection, the setting of the second setting item is changed from the second value into the fourth value so as to avoid the conflict between the first setting item and the second setting item without displaying the window for accepting a selection by a user. These

features of the changing unit or step can read on steps S3109-S3116 of Figure 31. However, any combination of Hower, Jr. et al. and DeHority at most would teach an arrangement including steps S3113, S3115, and S3116. The proposed combination would fail to disclose or suggest at least the step of S3114 which can be deemed to correspond to the third determination unit or step. The proposed combination does not disclose or suggest the three options of the present invention, which depend on whether the user makes the selection. That is, the proposed combination fails to disclose or suggest that a setting value which conflicts with another setting value can be chosen from among a changed value, an unchanged value selected by a user, or a value selected by a system in conformity with the system requirements. It is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination fails to disclose or suggest the details of the change unit and change step recited in the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 87, 92 and 97. Dependent Claims 88-91, 93-96, and 98-101 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW/ytr

FCHS_WS 1491072v1